Exhibit 1

Page 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA AT CHARLESTON

JO HUSKEY AND ALLAN HUSKEY, :

Plaintiffs, : CASE NUMBER

v. : 2:12-cv-05201

ETHICON, INC., ET AL., :

Defendants. :

TRANSCRIPT OF TRIAL - DAY FIVE

AUGUST 28, 2014

BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOSEPH R. GOODWIN,
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Court Reporter: Carol Farrell, CRR, RMR, CCP, RPR

(304)347 - 3188

carol_farrell@wvsd.uscourts.gov

Anthony Rolland, CRR, RMR, RPR

(407)760-6023

rolland.crr@gmail.com

Proceedings recorded by machine stenography; transcript produced by computer.

```
Page 2
1
    APPEARANCES
 2
 3
    FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:
 4
     EDWARD A. WALLACE, ESQUIRE
 5
    MARK R. MILLER, ESQUIRE
     Wexler Wallace
     55 West Monroe Street, Suite 3300
 6
     Chicago, IL 60603
 7
     FIDELMA L. FITZPATRICK, ESQUIRE
 8
    Motley Rice
     321 South Main Street, Suite 200
    Providence, RI 02903
     JEFFREY M. KUNTZ, ESQUIRE
10
     Wagstaff & Cartmell
     4740 Grand Avenue, Suite 300
11
     Kansas City, MO 64112
12
13
     FOR THE DEFENDANTS:
14
     CHRISTY D. JONES, ESQUIRE
15
     Butler, Snow, O'Mara, Stevens & Cannada, PLLC
     1020 Highland Colony Parkway, Suite 1400
16
    Ridgeland, MS 39157
     DAVID B. THOMAS, ESQUIRE
17
     PHILIP J. COMBS, ESQUIRE
     Thomas Combs & Spann
18
     PO Box 3824
    Charleston, WV 25338-3824
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

								Page	3
1		I N	D	Ŀ	Χ				
2		Dir	ect	Cr	OSS	Redirect	Recro	oss	
3	WITNESSES FOR THE PLAINTIFFS			O.L		REGITEGE	11001		
4	JO BETH HUSKEY	19			69	97			
5 6	JERRY BLAIVAS, M.D.	106			224				
7									
8	EXHIBITS				I	dent.	Evid.		
9	P-90017 P-90016 P-90019						20 23 29		
10	P-90020 P-588						33 43		
11	P-91407C D-10029					X X	10		
12	P-91405B P-90001						105 107		
13	P-90001A P-20176						149 158		
14	P-20178 P-20180					X	170		
15	P-21420 P-21379						188 190		
16	P-21433 P-20015					X	192		
17	D-23591 D-23605						234 242		
18									
19									
20									
21									
23									
24									
25									

Page 13 Illinois law, Jo Huskey, will say --1 2 THE COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry. I didn't hear. 3 MR. WALLACE: I'm sorry. The plaintiff, Jo Huskey, will say that the bills are 4 5 paid, and that is prima facie evidence that they're paid. 6 that's our -- that's our point. 7 THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. MS. JONES: I have no --8 9 THE COURT: Dr. Blaivas, I reserve ruling on the reliability of his opinion. I've had some briefing on it. 10 11 still don't understand it, so I'm just going to flat ask the 12 question and see if I can get a handle on it before I confront 13 it. MS. FITZPATRICK: Okay. I think Your Honor's 14 15 question was on the pubovaginal sling article that deals with sphincteric deficiency. I'm going to try to explain this. 16 17 Stress urinary incontinence is a symptom of a few 18 different issues. For example, you can have stress urinary 19 incontinence from having a fistula or a hole in your bladder That would cause urine to leak because of that hole. 20 You can have stress urinary incontinence because you have an 21 22 overactive bladder that is constantly contracting and forcing 23 urine out. You can also have what Ms. Huskey has, what we're 24 dealing with in these particular cases, you can have stress urinary incontinence because the sphincter between your 25

Page 14

- 1 bladder and your urethra is not working properly, either
- 2 because the urethra has descended or for whatever reason.
- 3 Those sphincteric deficiencies are the reason that a
- 4 woman would get either the polypropylene sling or the
- 5 autologous fascial sling or a Burch procedure.
- 6 THE COURT: Okay. I understand your answer.
- 7 What's the objection? If sphincteric incontinence
- 8 is, in fact, what Ms. Huskey has, your objection relating to
- 9 this witness's testimony because the article only dealt with
- 10 sphincteric incontinence has now left me wandering in the
- 11 wilderness.
- MS. JONES: I think that the objection is twofold,
- 13 Your Honor. The paragraph that Your Honor asked for or asked
- 14 us about out of Dr. Blaivas' report specifically is one that
- 15 starts out saying that pubovaginal slings using autologous
- 16 fascia are safer than synthetic slings.
- 17 And he cites two articles in support of that. One
- 18 was admittedly a mistake. It's an animal study, and he came
- 19 back and substituted that. One of those articles that he
- 20 cites is his own article. First, there's no showing in this
- 21 case that Mrs. Huskey has been diagnosed with ISD, and,
- 22 secondly --
- 23 THE COURT: Is that what is referred to -- what I
- 24 just referred to as sphincteric incontinence as opposed to the
- 25 other kinds of reasons?

Case 2:12-md-02327 Document 2218-1 Filed 05/16/16 Page 7 of 10 PageID #: 69896 Page 15 MS. JONES: Stress urinary incontinence. secondly, Your Honor -- I guess twofold. It's Dr. Blaivas cites his own article in support of the statement, and although he says that it remains the gold standard for other surgeries for treating sphincteric incontinence, he never says in here specifically that, one, they're safer than -- or been established to be safer than the midurethral slings, and, B, Your Honor, if you look at the citations or his references, there's not a single reference dated later than 2005, after the midurethral slings became available. They also then cited the Wadie article, Autologous Fascial Sling Vs. Polypropylene Tape, and, again, Your Honor, this article does not support the statement that midurethral -- that autologous fascial slings are safer than the midurethral slings. In fact, what it says is autologous fascial sling and TVT have comparable efficacy in treating SUI, adverse-event-related differences are marginal in the short term, a larger sample size and follow-up are needed to reach a final conclusion, so --THE COURT: What was the last part of that sentence? After you said the differences are marginal in the short term, the larger sample size what?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. JONES: I'm not sure I have it exactly. A larger sample size and longer follow-up are needed to draw a final conclusion.

Page 16 THE COURT: All right. I'm not putting words in your 1 Is it your argument that, with your characterization 2 of those two articles, that there is an insufficient basis to 3 establish the reliability of the opinion he offers? Is that 5 what your point is? 6 MS. JONES: It is, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: All right. Ms. Fitzpatrick. MS. FITZPATRICK: Your Honor, there are a number of 8 articles on Dr. Blaivas' reliance list that go specifically to 9 this issue. What is a key issue in this case is both the 10 comparison of the efficacy, which is one issue, and the safety 11 12 of these two devices. Dr. Blaivas has for 25-plus years put in autologous 13 fascial slings in hundreds, if not thousands, of patients. 14 15 has followed those patients. He is relying on his experience in doing this surgery and what he sees in the surgery, in this 16 17 way very similar to what Dr. Pramudji testified when she said, 18 "I've put in 300 polypropylene slings and I have very few 19 complications." He's going to testify based on his experience. 20 21 He's also going to testify, because he's a primary 22 researcher in the area of autologous fascial slings. 23 are few other people in this country who are more qualified 24 from an experience standpoint, a research standpoint, and a publication standpoint on opining in peer-reviewed articles 25

Page 17

- 1 about the efficacy of the autologous fascial sling as well as
- 2 the safety and the complications that you see from those
- 3 autologous fascial slings.
- I will, I believe, more than adequately lay a
- 5 foundation for those particular opinions in his testimony
- 6 that's based on -- my understanding here was that the issue
- 7 was the particular article that we had an issue and whether
- 8 sphincteric deficiency was equivalent to the type of SUI that
- 9 we are seeing in this case. And the answer to that, and
- 10 Dr. Blaivas can give you that, is a resounding yes. That's
- 11 exactly what he's talking about here.
- So I think that the article is precisely on point, I
- 13 think his experience, I think his own research, I think the
- 14 literature is going for him, a more than sufficient foundation
- 15 for him to opine the --
- 16 THE COURT: The literature -- the literature that is
- on his reliance list beyond the article he wrote?
- 18 MS. FITZPATRICK: There is literature on his reliance
- 19 list beyond the article that he wrote.
- THE COURT: Which is peer-reviewed literature
- 21 supporting his opinion?
- MS. FITZPATRICK: That is correct, Your Honor.
- 23 THE COURT: Okay. Well, I'm inclined to allow it.
- 24 I'll just to have wait until I hear it now. There's still
- 25 some question in my mind, I'll wait and see what happens.

```
Page 18
    Back in the dark ages, that's the way we used to let witnesses
1
     actually testify, was whether they could do it on the stand or
 2
     not, not with advisory rulings a year ahead.
 3
              Everything else ready to go? If --
 4
 5
              MS. FITZPATRICK: Your Honor, could you give me two
    minutes to make some arrangements for Dr. Carey?
 6
7
              THE COURT: Oh, absolutely. Absolutely. The jury
     won't be here for a couple minutes.
 8
 9
              MS. FITZPATRICK: Okay. I appreciate that. Thank
10
     you.
11
              THE COURT: I'll be right back. Court stands in
12
     recess.
13
              (A recess was taken at 8:59 a.m.)
14
              (The jury entered the courtroom at 9:06 a.m.)
15
              COURT SERVICES OFFICER: All rise.
16
              THE COURT: Good morning.
17
             RESPONSE: Good morning.
18
              THE COURT: Call your next witness, Mr. Wallace.
19
              MR. WALLACE: Your Honor, we would like to call to
20
     the stand Jo Beth Huskey.
21
              THE COURT: All right.
22
              THE DEPUTY CLERK: Ms. Huskey, if you will please
23
     raise your right hand.
24
     (JO BETH HUSKEY, HAVING BEEN DULY SWORN, TESTIFIED AS
     FOLLOWS:)
25
```